

cert. denied 380 U.S. 956 (1965)); Hollar v. Myers, 184 B.R. 243, 246 (M.D.N.C. 1995) (“It is well-settled that the filing of a motion for protective order does not automatically operate to stay a deposition or other discovery. Rather, a deponent is relieved of his or her duty to appear only if [a] court order is granted before the scheduled deposition.”) (internal citations omitted).

However, Defendants have not yet responded to the Motion for Protective Order, and their deadline for doing so has not expired. The Court finds that to ensure the orderly disposition of the issues set forth in the Motion for Protective Order, the parties should be given an opportunity to brief the Motion fully, and that a ruling on the Motion should be issued before the deposition is taken.

Accordingly, the deposition of Plaintiff is **TEMPORARILY STAYED** pending the Court’s ruling on Plaintiff’s Motion for Protective Order That His Deposition be Taken Remotely, via Computer Technology (Doc. 27).

It is so ordered.

Signed: July 7, 2020



W. Carleton Metcalf
United States Magistrate Judge

